

On the use of qualitative comparative analysis in management

Seny Kan, Anderson Konan; Adegbite, Emmanuel; El Omari, Sami; Abdellatif, Mahamat

DOI:

[10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.125](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.125)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Seny Kan, AK, Adegbite, E, El Omari, S & Abdellatif, M 2015, 'On the use of qualitative comparative analysis in management', *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 69, no. 4, pp. 1458-1463.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.10.125>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

After an embargo period this document is subject to the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial No Derivatives license

Checked December 2015

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

On the use of Qualitative Comparative Analysis in management

Anderson Konan Seny Kan, University of Toulouse – Toulouse Business School

Emmanuel Adegbite, Durham University

Sami El Omari, University of Toulouse – Toulouse Business School

Mahamat Abdellatif, University of Toulouse – LGCO Research Team

July 2015

The authors thank the anonymous reviewers, the special issue JBR editors, and the participants at the 2015 GIKA conference held in Valencia, Spain, for their careful reading and suggestions. Send correspondence to Anderson Konan Seny Kan, Toulouse Business School, 20 Boulevard Lascrosses, Toulouse, France (ka.seny-kan@tbs-education.fr);

Emmanuel Adegbite, Durham University, Mill Hill Lane, Durham, UK

(emmanuel.adegbite@durham.ac.uk); Sami El Omari, Toulouse Business School, 20

Boulevard Lascrosses, Toulouse, France (s.elomari@tbs-education.fr); Mahamat Abdellatif,

University of Toulouse, Paul Sabatier University, 129 A avenue de Rangueil, Toulouse,

France (mahamat.abdellatif@iut-tlse3.fr).

Abstract

Researchers now use Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) beyond its original purposes in political and sociological sciences and apply this method of analysis in the field of management. This article offers a comprehensive and critical review of all the uses of QCA in management studies up until February 2015. This study shows how QCA extends beyond an empirical technique and how this method offers a genuine formalization of qualitative analysis, which opens new ways of knowledge production in management scholarship. This also study provides important implications for business management research.

Keywords: Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA); management; organization; crisp-set; fuzzy-set, multi-value

1. Introduction

The Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA) derives from the classical comparative methods that John Stuart Mill theorizes in 1843. Ragin (1987) develops and popularizes the method in his seminal work. The QCA is a tool and approach for researchers who want to find a balance between case-oriented and variable-oriented analysis (De Meur & Rihoux, 2002). The QCA constitutes a useful analytical method for cross-case analysis (Miles & Huberman, 2003) that focuses on the complexity that characterizes the cases under investigation. Cases are configurations of variables; this definition has a dual purpose: First, these configurations reveal the trajectories and paths that variables follow to achieve similar or different results. Second, these configurations provide explanatory paths with complex causality and where combination of factors explains a research result. QCA is also an approach as well as a research technique (Curchod, 2003; Rihoux & Marx, 2013). In this regard, QCA aids in the identification of causal structures (Ragin, 1987). QCA is therefore an instrumentation of generic analytical approaches for which qualitative methodologists advocate (Miles & Huberman, 2003).

QCA draws on Boolean algebra and set-theoretic approaches, and operates through two types of software: those based on graphical user interface (GUI) (e.g., TOSMANA, and fsQCA) and those based on command line interface (CLI) (e.g., R, and Stata packages). The areas of research that use QCA are mostly political sciences and sociology (Rihoux et al., 2013). However, although management research increasingly uses QCA, this method still remains relatively new to a large number of scholars and no critical review and overview on its use in management research exists.

Hence, the contribution of this article is twofold. First, this study is the first comprehensive analysis of the use of QCA in management research (up until February 2015). This attempt thus helps to structure the literature for existing and potential QCA users.

Second, by organizing the field, the study identifies current management issues of interest and how researchers investigate these issues through QCA. This discussion shows how QCA extends beyond an empirical technique, and offers a genuine formalization of qualitative analysis, which opens new ways of knowledge production in management scholarship.

Following this introduction, the next section explains the research method for this study. Section 3 presents the main issues that management research studies through QCA and the main contributions to the literature. The last section comprises conclusions and presents some implications for future studies.

2. Research method: A content analysis

2.1. Delimiting the scope of the investigation

This study first identified management articles using QCA in Web of Science database and then triangulated the results with the COMPASSSS database. The final sample comprised 95 articles from aggregated databases (Cairn, Ebsco and Science Direct) and publishers (Sage and Emerald) (see Figure 1). To obtain the articles, the study used six sets of keywords. The first set combined the themes “Qualitative Comparative Analysis”, “QCA” and “Management”. From this combination, the second, third, fourth, fifth and sixth used “Fuzzy-set”, “fsQCA”, “mvQCA”, “Crisp-set”, and “csQCA” respectively instead of “QCA”.

2.2. Coding methods for data reduction

The study developed a theme dictionary (Figure 2). The review, the object of research and the research objective helped to identify management areas of interest. This study assessed whether researchers use QCA for its intrinsic value (i.e., extending the understanding of management practices) and/or instrumentally, that is, for its extrinsic value (the interest of the management phenomenon is secondary). Finally, regarding the scope of an article, this

study assessed to which extent researchers add new theoretical perspectives to the area of research.

Figure 1 here.

QCA comprises three variants: crisp-set, multi-value and fuzzy-set. This research considers as types of studies: empirical, theoretical, and methodological studies. Regarding cases, this study inductively identified four attributes for type of cases: country, organization, individual, or other types of cases that do not fit in the first three categories.

Figure 2 here.

3. Anatomy of investigated management phenomenon

Researchers use QCA mainly to investigate four major management objects across eleven research domains (see Figure 3), with an underlying primary mode of generation of knowledge (i.e., test of existing theories).

3.1. Underlying order of the diverse usage of QCA in management

Results show that management researchers use QCA mostly to study four issues (see Figure 4). Figure 5 indicates that combining QCA with other conventional methods is more frequent than the use of QCA by itself; fuzzy-set methods are the most habitual. Figure 6 shows that the use of QCA in management involves diverse units of analysis.

Figure 3 here.

Figure 4 here.

Figure 5 here.

Figure 6 here.

3.1.1. Internal processes and organizational structures

Researchers generally focus on four aspects when studying the internal environment of an organization: processes, actors and their actions; industry and organization structure; influence of organizational structure on the actors; and performance.

Regarding processes, studies such as management-practices adoption and innovation (Ganter & Hecker, 2013) are focal points. Actors' actions and their consequences in organizational processes are equally important (Young & Poon, 2013).

Regarding industry and organization structure, studies concentrate on industry development, the effect of structural changes, conditions for the organizations' sustainability, and specification of organizational forms (García-Castro & Casasola, 2011). For the influence of organizational structure on actors, researchers focus mainly on the analysis of the workplace (Chang & Cheng, 2013). Finally, research focuses on performance at a national, industry and/or organizational level (Stanko & Olleros, 2013).

3.1.2. Organizational external environment

Researchers examine organizations' external environment from two perspectives. First, researchers attempt to understand the behavior of organization's external actors, particularly consumers (Kent, 2005; Woodside et al., 2011). Second, studies examine and update capitalism literature by increasing diversity and coverage of research. Here, QCA appears as a means to refine existing typologies (Judge et al., 2014).

3.1.3. Overlaps within and between organizational environments

Management deals with three main streams of research in this category. First, the identification of the conditions for successful innovation and knowledge transfer constitutes one of the main research objects. In addition, the nature of inter-organizational relationship,

management capacity and organizational compatibility (Leischnig et al., 2013), and absorption capacity of the organization are also relevant. The emergence of forms of inter-organizational relationship (Chung, 2001) and relational dynamics are two other research objects in this first stream (Tóth et al., 2014).

Second, the competitive position of the organization or how the dynamics of the organization's external environment shapes organizational behavior (Järvinen et al., 2009). Other studies focus on organizational reactions to external actors' demands (Ordanini & Maglio, 2009) or pressures that external institutions exert (Maggetti, 2014).

Third, researchers strive to explain the characteristics of national economies (Allen & Aldred, 2011; Freitag & Schlicht, 2009), and organizational external actors' behavior, which includes investors and consumers (Bell et al., 2014).

3.1.4. Promoting a methodological alternative

Promoting QCA in management research mainly operates in four distinct but complementary ways. First, by familiarizing the management research community with the benefits of using QCA to understand organizational phenomena (Curchod, 2003). Second, by highlighting the relevance of the use of QCA in specific management domains such as marketing (Kent, 2009a; 2009b; Woodside & Zhang, 2012), public management (Kitchener et al., 2002), leadership (Ford et al., 2013), B to B decision-making (Woodside & Baxter, 2013), and configurations/typologies of organizations (Fiss, 2007; 2011). Third, by identifying the specificities of QCA's own empirical processes (Duşa, 2007; Woodside, 2011; Woodside et al., 2012). The fourth category deals with the need to legitimize the use of QCA by contrasting this method with management literature's traditional empirical methods. Although the QCA is half-way between quantitative and qualitative methods (De Meur & Rihoux, 2002), research usually contrasts QCA with quantitative (Kent & Argouslidis 2005;

Woodside, 2010; 2013) rather than with qualitative methods (Öz, 2004; Woodside et al., 2012). The fact that researchers increasingly use QCA to analyze large-N although this method's original purpose was to analyze small-N could explain this tendency (Greckhamer et al., 2013; Fiss et al., 2013).

3.2. *Forms of knowledge generation*

The generation of knowledge can be the result of research that focuses either on theory or on practice (Dul & Hak, 2008). As this research only considers academic articles, the theoretical perspective is more prominent even though authors often include managerial implications of their research. In addition, QCA contributes to management research mostly by testing existing theories rather than creating new ones.

3.2.1. *New investigations of earlier hypotheses or propositions of existing theories*

The use of QCA can contribute to management knowledge by replicating earlier studies through the re-examination of data. Such studies aim to increase research validity (Aguilera-Caracuel et al., 2014), nuance (Woodside & Zhang, 2013), or question existing knowledge (Woodside & Baxter, 2013).

Another type of studies that use original data seeks a review of the links that existing theories commonly accept but do not investigate sufficiently. These studies contribute to knowledge by suggesting nuances to a deeper extent (e.g., Koll et al., 2005). Other studies contribute by testing existing theories (Kent, 2005). Some studies also present facts/evidences that settle an academic debate. Furthermore, some studies advocate for a specific theory among several competing ones (Allen & Aldred, 2011; Sager, 2004).

3.2.2. Investigation of new hypotheses/propositions deriving from existing theories

The QCA contributes to the generation of management knowledge also through the formulation of new sets of hypotheses within existing theories. Studies that fall into this category focus on identifying sufficient conditions that explain a specific management phenomenon. Commonly, these studies confirm (Kalleberg & Vaisey, 2005), complement (Vis et al., 2007) or provide more nuances to the existing knowledge (e.g., Moritz et al., 2011; Ordanini & Maglio, 2009). Other studies seek to confirm existing knowledge (Schneider et al., 2010).

3.2.3. Exploration of new relationships between management phenomena

Here researchers seek to contribute to management knowledge by attempting to build new theories through QCA to explain the links between management phenomena and theoretical causes (Verweij, 2015; Wu et al., 2014). In this vein, Fiss (2011), for example, constructs a theory of core and peripheral determinants of organizational causalities. Another way of contributing to management research is by introducing new management issues and investigating the causes (Tóth et al., 2014).

3.2.4. Rekindling the heuristic of the management phenomenon

If the aim of research in management is to support organizational decision-making, accesses to management realities are always a matter of debate in the management academic community. A part of these debates is whether to approach management realities through quantitative methods or through qualitative methods.

Assuming that knowledge assessment in management research revolves around the knowledge's generalization, accuracy and complexity, Woodside (2010b) points out that none of the two methods can individually satisfy those three evaluation criteria. Thus, the

promotion of QCA stresses that the validity of knowledge that emerges can derive from the combination of three evaluation criteria.

Within this debate, QCA helps to address some of the criticisms of qualitative (Öz, 2004; Woodside et al., 2012) and quantitative studies (Greckhamer et al., 2008; Kent, 2009a; 2009b; Woodside, 2011) by achieving better generalization and accuracy (Woodside, 2010). Paradoxically, QCA alone appears not to be sufficient to capture management issues. Therefore, researchers very often use QCA in combination with other traditional research methods. In addition, QCA helps to highlight the asymmetric nature (i.e., positive or negative instances of a management phenomenon that the same determinants cannot explain), as well as the configurational (i.e., positive or negative instances of a management phenomenon that isolated determinants do not explain) and causal complexities (i.e., management phenomenon determinants that link with complementarity and/or substitutability relations which vary according to the context) of a management phenomenon.

This comprehensive analysis also distinguishes some critical issues regarding the way researchers use QCA for management realities investigation. First, although QCA "sits midway between exploration and hypothesis-testing research" (Kent, 2005, p. 226), this research shows that researchers use QCA mostly to test management theories instead of using this method for exploratory analyses. Second, despite the systematic comparison of QCA with quantitative methods, the QCA has an original role in strengthening knowledge generation through a dialogue between case studies and theory. Third, Fiss (2007) emphasizes that QCA is helpful to limit the recurring mismatching between theory and methods in management research. That objective may be unachievable due to a large size of cases under investigation. Woodside and Baxter (2013) suggest between 5 and 50 as a number of cases to study, although many of the articles this study mentions deal with a large-N.

4. Discussion and conclusion

This study encourages scholars to renew the understanding of management realities. Indeed, QCA reveals that management realities comprise two forms of explanatory paths. First, this review highlights that a specific management reality may have a multiplicity of causal paths. Some researchers see management realities as a manifestation of the equifinality principle. In addition, some authors attempt to show that the knowledge about explanatory paths of a management reality does not always imply an understanding of the absence of its manifestation. This fact demonstrates the asymmetric nature of management phenomena (e.g., Verweij, 2015; Wu et al., 2014). However, the study of management phenomena mainly focuses on positive occurrences. These studies tend to emphasize the principle of equifinality while ignoring asymmetrical aspects of management phenomena (e.g., Järvinen et al., 2009; Woodside & Zhang, 2013). This perspective emphasizes that management phenomena vary in degree and nature.

Second, although the explanatory pluralism is a central approach to QCA, this research further suggests that not all management realities are subject to multiple explanatory paths (Stanko & Olleros, 2013; Vis et al., 2007; Woodside et al., 2011). This fact has implications for the equifinality principle.

Overall, these two forms of causal paths associate with managerial configurations and make more actionable the knowledge that QCA generates.

This article extends previous works on QCA's benefits to management (e.g., Curchod 2003; Fiss, 2007; 2011). The results suggest that researchers apply QCA to four management situations. The first relates to the internal environment of the organization; the second to the external environment; the third relates to the links within and between these environments; and the fourth situation deals with the optimal way to question management phenomena. In

most of the articles, the use of QCA serves an objective of renewing the understanding of management situations by means of a review of the existing theories.

This research has several implications for management research. First, general management and marketing are the areas that apply QCA the most. This finding is indicative of where future research should direct efforts. In addition, the QCA can offer new investigation opportunities in areas that already apply this method. Second, studies use QCA mostly to test existing theories, although this method could be appropriate for exploring contemporary management realities and/or developing new theories. Third, studies use two forms of QCA (i.e., crisp-set or csQCA and fuzzy-set or fsQCA) than the QCA in its multi-value form (mvQCA) to investigate management phenomena. This form of QCA could suit certain management realities as Verweij (2015) evidences. Fourth, QCA allows researchers to distinguish necessary and/or sufficient conditions for the occurrence of organizational phenomena, which could be useful in addressing a central criticism of management research: the lack of actionability. In this vein, the equifinal nature of some organizational outcomes may be beneficial to the managerial decision making. Fifth, QCA could help to better approximate some management realities that are difficult to measure (Viswanathan et al., 1996).

Overall, the use of QCA in management research highlights that the complexity of management phenomena contains parsimonious causal paths that research can unveil. Thus, QCA can improve the understanding of management realities while preserving their holistic nature.

References

- Aguilera-Caracuel, J., Fedriani, E. M., & Delgado-Márquez, B. L. (2014). Institutional distance among country influences and environmental performance standardization in multinational enterprises. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(11), 2385–92.
- Allen, M. M. C., & Aldred, M. L. (2011). Varieties of capitalism, governance, and high-tech export performance : A fuzzy-set analysis of the new EU member states. *Employee Relations*, 33(4), 334–355.
- Bell, R., Greg, F. I., & Aguilera, R. V. (2014). Corporate governance and investors' perceptions of foreign IPO value: An institutional perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 57(1), 301–320.
- Chang, M-L., & Cheng, C-F. (2013). How balance theory explains high-tech professionals' solutions of enhancing job satisfaction. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(9), 2008–2018.
- Chung, C-N. (2001). Markets, culture and institutions: The emergence of large business groups in taiwan, 1950s-1970s. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38(5), 719–45.
- Colquitt, J. A., & George, G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ, Part 1: Topic Choice [Editorial]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(3), 432–435.
- Curchod, C. (2003). The comparative method in management science: Towards a qualitative approach to managerial reality. *Finance, Control and Strategy*, 6(2), 155–77.
- De Meur, G., & Rihoux, B. (2002). The qualitative comparative analysis (QCA-QCA): Approach, humanities and technical applications. Leuven: Academia-Bruylant.

- Dul, J., & Hak, T. (2008). *Case study methodology in business research*. Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann
- Duşa, A. (2007). User manual for the QCA(GUI) package in R. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(5), 576–86.
- Fiss, P. C. (2007). A set-theoretic approach to organizational configurations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4), 1180–1198.
- Fiss, P. C. (2011). Building better causal theories: A fuzzy set approach to typologies in organization research. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(2), 393–420.
- Fiss, P. C., Cambré, B., & Marx, A. (2013). *Configurational Theory and Methods in Organizational Research. Research in the Sociology of the Organizations*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Ford, L. R., Seers, A., & Neumann, J. (2013). Honoring complexity: Set-theoretic analysis as a complementary method in leadership research. *Management Research Review*, 36(7), 644–663.
- Freitag, M., & Schlicht, R. (2009). Educational federalism in Germany: Foundations of social inequality in education. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 22(1), 47–72.
- Ganter, A., & Hecker, A. (2013). Configurational paths to organizational innovation: qualitative comparative analyses of antecedents and contingencies. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1285–1292.
- García-Castro, R., & Casasola, J. (2011). A set-theoretic analysis of the components of family involvement in publicly listed and major unlisted firms. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 2(1), 15–25.

- Grant, A. M. & Pollock, T.G. (2011). Publishing in AMJ. Part 3: Setting the Hook [Editorial]. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(5), 873–879.
- Greckhamer, T., Misangyi, V.F., Elms, H., & Lacey, R. (2008). Using qualitative comparative analysis in strategic management research: An examination of combinations of industry, corporate, and business-unit effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 11(4), 695–726.
- Greckhamer, T., Misangyi, V. F., & Fiss, P. C. (2013). The two QCAs: From a small-N to a large-N set theoretic approach. In P. C. Fiss, B. Cambré & A. Marx (eds), *Configurational Theory and Methods in Organizational Research. Research in the Sociology of the Organizations*. UK: Emerald Group Publishing. pp. 49-75.
- Järvinen, J., Lamberg, J-A., & Murmann, J-P., & Ojala, J. (2009). Alternative paths to competitive advantage: A fuzzy-set analysis of the origins of large firms. *Industry and Innovation*, 16(6), 545–74.
- Judge, W. Q., Fainshmidt, S., & Brown Iii, J. L. (2014). Which Model of Capitalism best delivers both Wealth and Equality? *Journal of International Business Studies*, 45(4), 363–386.
- Kalleberg, A. L., & Vaisey, S. (2005). Pathways to a good job: Perceived work quality among the machinists in north america. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43(3), 431–454.
- Kent, R. A. (2005). Cases as configurations: Using combinatorial and fuzzy logic to analyse marketing data. *International Journal of Market Research*, 47(2), 205–28.
- Kent, R. (2009a). Rethinking data analysis -- part one. *International Journal of Market Research*, 51(1), 51–69.


- Kent, R. (2009b). Rethinking data analysis -- part two Some alternatives to frequentist approaches. *International Journal of Market Research*, 51(2), 181–202.
- Kent, R. A., & Argouslidis, P. C. (2005). Shaping business decisions using fuzzy-set analysis: service elimination decisions. *Journal of Marketing Management*, 21(5/6), 641–658.
- Kitchener, M., Beynon, M., & Harrington, C. (2002). Qualitative comparative analysis and public services research: Lessons from an early application. *Public Management Review*, 4(4), 485–504.
- Koll, O., Woodside, A. G., & Mühlbacher, H. (2005). alanced versus focused responsiveness to core constituencies and organizational effectiveness. *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(9-10), 1166–1183.
- Leischnig, A., Geigenmueller, A., Lohmann, S. (2013). On the role of alliance management capability, organizational compatibility, and interaction quality in interorganizational technology transfer. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(6), 1049–1057.
- Maggetti, M. (2014). Promoting corporate responsibility in private banking: Necessary and sufficient conditions for joining the Wolfsberg Initiative against money laundering. *Business & Society*, 53(6), 787–819.
- Marx, A., & Van Hootegeem, G. (2007). Comparative configurational case analysis of ergonomic injuries. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(5), 522–30.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2003). *Qualitative Data Analysis* (2 ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moritz, M., Giblin, J., Ciccone, M., Davis, A., Fuhrman, J., Kimiaie M., Madzsar, S., Olson, K., & Senn, M. (2011). Social risk-management strategies in pastoral systems: a qualitative comparative analysis. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 45(3), 286–317.

- Ordanini, A., & Maglio, P. P. (2009). Market orientation, internal process, and external network: A qualitative comparative analysis of key decisional alternatives in the new service development, *Decision Sciences*, 40(3), 601–625
- Öz, Ö. (2004). Using Boolean and fuzzy-logic-based methods to analyze multiple case study evidence in management research. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 13(2), 166–179.
- Ragin, C. C. (1987), *The comparative method: Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative Strategies*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rihoux, B., & Marx, A. (2013). Qualitative comparative analysis at 25: State of play and agenda. *Political Research Quarterly*, 66(1), 167–171.
- Rihoux, B., Álamos-Concha, P., Bol, D., Marx, A., & Rezsöházy, I. (2013). From niche to mainstream method? A comprehensive mapping of QCA applications in journal articles from 1984 to 2011. *Political Research Quarterly*, 66(1), 175-184.
- Sager, F. (2004). Metropolitan Institutions and Policy Coordination: The Integration of Land Use and Transport Policies in Swiss Urban Areas. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 18(2), 227–256.
- Schneider, M. R., Schulze-Bentrop, C., & Paunescu, M. (2010). Mapping the institutional capital of high-tech firms: A fuzzy-set analysis of capitalist variety and export performance. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 41(2), 246–66.
- Stanko, M.A., & Olleros, X. (2013). Industry growth and the knowledge spillover regime: Does outsourcing harm innovativeness but help profit? *Journal of Business Research*, 66(10), 2007–2016.
- Tóth, Z., Thiesbrummel, C., Henneberg, S. C., & Naudé, P. (2015). Understanding configurations of relational attractiveness of the customer firm using fuzzy set qca. *Journal of Business Research*, 68(3), 723–734.

- Verweij, S. (2015). Achieving satisfaction when implementing ppp transportation infrastructure projects: a qualitative comparative analysis of the a15 highway dbfm project. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(1), 189–200.
- Vis, B., Woldendorp, J., & Keman, H. (2007). Do miracles exist? Analyzing economic performance comparatively. *Journal of Business Research*, 60(5), 531–38.
- Viswanathan, M., Bergen, M., Dutta, S., & Childers, T. (1996). Does a single response category in a scale completely capture a response? *Psychology & Marketing*, 13(5), 457–79.
- Woodside, A. G. (2008). Anti-social behaviour: Profiling the lives behind road rage. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 26(5), 49–480.
- Woodside, A. G. (2010a). *Case study research: Theory, methods and practice*. Bingley, UK: Emerald.
- Woodside, A. G. (2010b). Bridging the chasm between survey and case study research: Research methods for achieving generalization, accuracy, and complexity. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 39(1), 64–75.
- Woodside, A. G. (2011). Responding to the severe limitations of cross-sectional surveys: Commenting on Rong and Wilkinson's perspectives. *Australasian Marketing Journal*, 19(3), 153–156.
- Woodside, A. G. (2013). Moving beyond multiple regression analysis to algorithms: Calling for adoption of a paradigm shift from symmetric to asymmetric thinking in data analysis and crafting theory. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(4), 463–472.

- Woodside, A. G., Baxter, R. (2013). Achieving accuracy, generalization-to-contexts, and complexity in theories of business-to-business decision processes. *Industrial Marketing Management*, 42(3), 382–393.
- Woodside, A. G., Hsu, S. Y., & Marshall, R. (2011). General theory of cultures' consequences on international tourism behavior. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(8), 785–799.
- Woodside, A. G., Ko, E. U, & Tzung-Cheng, H. (2012). The new logic in building isomorphic theory of management decision realities. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 765–777.
- Woodside, A. G., & Zhang, M. (2013). Cultural diversity and marketing transactions: Are market integration, large community size, and world religions necessary for fairness in ephemeral exchanges? *Psychology & Marketing*, 30(3), 263–76.
- Wu, P. L., Shih-Shuo, Y., Tzung-Cheng, H., & Woodside, A. G. (2014). Applying complexity theory to deepen service dominant logic: Configural analysis of customer experience-and-outcome assessments of professional services for personal transformations. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1647–70.
- Young, R., & Poon, S. (2013). Top management support—almost always necessary and sometimes sufficient for success: Findings from a fuzzy set analysis. *International Journal of Project Management*, 31(7), 943–957.

Figure 1. Use of QCA in management



Note: This figure shows every article that this study analyzes. However, the reference section includes only those works that this article explicitly references.

Figure 2. Dictionary of themes for the articles analysis




Figure 3. Management domain using QCA




Figure 4. Organizational issues studied using QCA






Figure 5. Use of QCA in management research



Notes: Other = Combination of crisp-set (csQCA) and / or fsQCA (fuzzy-set) with conventional methods. MvQCA= multi-value QCA

Figure 6. Unit of analysis



Notes: Other = Any other subject that does not fit in the three other categories (e.g., Stanko & Olleros, 2013; Young & Poon, 2013).